DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 152 RC 006 937

AUTHOR Teske, Raymond, Jr.; Nelson, Bardin H.
TITLE Two Scales for the Measurement of Mexican-American Identity.
PUB DATE Mar 73
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Society Meeting, Dallas, Texas, March 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; Correlation; Employment; *Identification (Psychological); *Interaction Process Analysis; *Males; *Measurement Techniques; *Mexican Americans; Rating Scales; Social Status; Sociometric Techniques; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

The development of scales to measure Mexican American identification with their population is discussed in this paper. The scales measure (1) identification with the Mexican American population using attitudinal items (Identity Scale) and (2) interaction behavior with the Mexican American population (Interaction Scale). The sample consisted of all Spanish surnamed males employed in the Texas communities of Waco (selected for pretesting), Austin, McAllen, and Lubbock. Names and occupations of Spanish surnamed males were obtained from the city directory. They were divided into occupations (labor, farm, or other) and 4 status groups. Individuals were interviewed in a random order using the 16 items in the Identity Scale and the 19 in the Interaction Scale. A panel of 5 Mexican Americans active in their communities assisted in developing the interview schedule and selecting items for the scales. To determine scale validity, each panel member was asked to evaluate the respondents' identification with the Mexican American population. Item analysis and intercorrelation are also discussed and scale items are given. (NQ)

ED 075152

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RECEIVED
MAY 31 1973
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

TWO SCALES FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF MEXICAN-AMERICAN IDENTITY

Raymond Teske, Jr. and Bardin H. Nelson
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Texas A&M University

Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Society Meetings, Dallas, March, 1973.

AC006937

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ABSTRACT

Two scales designed to measure Mexican-American identity are presented. The scales were developed from data collected in McAllen, Austin, Lubbock, and Waco, Texas. One scale is designed to measure identification with the Mexican-American population per se, and consists of attitudinal-type items. The second scale is concerned with behavior and centers on interaction with the Mexican-American population. High correlation between scores on the two scales was observed. Item analysis and item intercorrelation are both reported.

An attitude can be defined as an enduring system of three components organized around a single object. These three components are: cognitive, or beliefs about the object; emotional or value orientation toward the object; and action tendencies concerning the object (Summers, 1970:2-4). Furthermore, it is recognized that an attitude as a relatively enduring system produces consistency in behavioral patterns. These ideas have been employed in the development of two scales designed to measure Mexican-American identity. One scale is designed to identify the emotional or value set of the respondent pursuant to identification with the Mexican-American population. The other scale is designed to measure the action tendency component as reflected by the behavioral patterns of the individual. More specifically, the second is designed to measure interaction patterns of the Mexican-American population reflective of identification with that population.

The purpose of this paper. then, is to report on the development of these two scales designed to measure identification with the Mexican-American population. The scales were developed in the course of an investigation of status mobility patterns among middle-class Mexican Americans in Texas and were designed primarily for use in the investigation as dependent variables. Subsequently, it is not intended that any conclusions or generalizations concerning the Mexican-American population be presented in this paper. Prior to reporting on the scales per se it is necessary to define the sampling procedures employed in the investigation in order to clarify the context in which they were developed.

Communities selected for sampling. Four communities were selected for sampling. The initial community, Waco, was selected for pretesting of the

sampling techniques. Availability of a panel of judges in the Waco community was the primary reason for pretesting in this community, as well as an expected limited population of Mexican Americans fitting the parameters established for sampling--thereby providing for a more valid evaluation of sampling techniques. The panel of judges consisted of five Mexican Americans, active in the Mexican-American community and well acquainted with the Mexican-American population. [For a published report on the middle-class Mexican-American population of Waco, Texas, see Teske and Nelson (1973).] The other three communities selected were McAllen, Austin, and Lubbock. Proximity to the Texas-Mexico border was the primary selection criterion with McAllen being closest to the border, Austin approximately in the middle of the state, and Lubbock of greater distance from the border.

Operational definition for middle-class status. For the purposes of the investigation employing this sample, social status was divided into four strata based on occupations. Several precedents may be cited supporting the use of occupation as a valid indicator of social status (c.f. Duncan, 1961; Gordon, 1958; Hall and Jones, 1950; Nam, 1963; Reiss, 1961; and Smith, 1943). The specific delineation of occupations is presented in Figure One below. It should also be noted here that the sample was limited to male members of the community.

Sampling procedures. The city directory for each community was used to acquire the names and specific occupation of all Spanish-surname males employed in the metropolitan area. [City directories are listed by community in the bibliography.] The directories list all individuals employed in a specified

area in a given year, their specific occupation, and address. A list provided by the U. S. Census Bureau was used to identify Spanish-surnames. An inventory was then compiled for each community consisting of all individuals with occupations fitting the prescribed parameters operationalized as middle-class for this investigation.

FIGURE ONE: STATUS CLASSIFICATION OF OCCUPATIONS

Status	Labor	Farm	Other
Upper	--	Owner of large estate	Independent wealth, proprietor of very large establishment, old family
Middle	White collar managerial, clerical, professional, semi-professional, major product sales, and so forth	Owner of large farm, manager of large farm	Proprietor of large establishment
Working class	Skilled, semi-skilled	Owner of small farm, foreman of farm or ranch	Owner of small business
Lower	Unskilled labor	Migrant farmer, tenant farmer, sharecropper	Self-employed but unskilled labor

In the case of Waco, that is, for pretesting purposes, the list of names was submitted to the panel of judges who screened the list for non-Mexican Americans (i.e., Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and so forth). In addition to screening the names, the judges were unable to suggest additional names, thereby leading the researchers to conclude that the method employed in acquiring the sample was substantially reliable. The panel of judges also evaluated the list

of proprietors in Waco according to the criteria defined in Figure One. The revised list of names for Waco was then submitted to trained interviewers who contacted each individual on the list; or, in the case of those who had moved, established that these individuals had indeed left the community.

Having satisfactorily determined the reliability of this procedure for defining a sample the researchers compiled a similar list for the other communities. In the case of proprietors, managers, and assistant managers, the director of the Chamber of Commerce in each community--or one of the members of his administrative staff--assisted with evaluation. Two criteria were provided for evaluation: (1) individual net profit or salary of approximately $10,000 or higher; (2) if the first criterion could not be estimated, place of residence such as to indicate middle-class neighborhood was acceptable.

Whereas samples were to be drawn from each of these communities every individual was then assigned a number beginning with 001 and this procedure was followed until the last number equaled the total population. Then, a table of random numbers was used to randomly order each population beginning with 001 and proceeding until the entire population had been ordered. [Table of random numbers is found in Huntsberger (1967).] Quotas were subsequently defined for each community. In the cases of Austin and McAllen the first 150 randomly ordered names of individuals were presented to trained interviewers for contact and interviewing. Since the total population of Lubbock consisted of 153 the interviewers received a list of the entire population randomly ordered.

Individuals were interviewed in order according to their randomly assigned rank until the quota for each community was reached. For example, the Austin

sample was to consist of fifty interviews. Therefore, individuals assigned numbers 001 through 050 were to be interviewed. Only when it had been determined that an individual had moved from the community, refused an interview, and so forth did the interviewers move on to number 051. Interviewers were also instructed to eliminate an individual if they failed to make contact after three attempts, though they were not prohibited from pursuing an individual if they thought contact could be made. In no community was the total of 150 names (153 in Lubbock) needed to meet the quota. Had they been required, additional names from the randomly ordered list would have been furnished. A subsequent follow-up by the investigators confirmed that the individuals listed as having been interviewed had in fact been interviewed.

In summary, the sample results consisted of thirty-two completed, usable interviews in Waco. No quota had been set for Waco since the entire population was to be contacted. Other sampling results, that is, completed and usable interviews, consisted of fifty-one in Austin, forty-one in McAllen, and twenty-seven in Lubbock. Completed, usable interviews for the four communities totaled 151.

Development of the scales and pretesting. The previously mentioned panel of judges assisted in the development of the interview schedule--consisting of thirty pages of data--and the selection of items to be used in the scales. The investigators had several meetings with the judges to discuss phrasing of items and the validity of selected items as indicators of identity with the Mexican-American population. Upon completion of the interviews these items were then abstracted from the interview schedules, coded, and analyzed.

Two separate scales were developed. One scale, hereafter referred to as the Identity scale , consists of attitudinal-type items and is designed to measure identification with the Mexican-American population (See Table 1). The other scale, defined as the Interaction scale, is designed to measure interaction with the Mexican-American population (See Table 2). More specifically, this scale consists of items designed to identify behavior patterns consistent with identification with the Mexican-American population. Each item was scored on a 1 to 5 continuum, with 1 designating strongest identification and 5 least identification with the Mexican-American population. Product-moment correlations between items and the scale score were used to evaluate items for inclusion in the scales. Sixteen items were retained in the Identity scale and nineteen in the Interaction scale (See Tables 4 and 5).

[TABLES 1 and 2 ABOUT HERE]

Two procedures were then introduced to evaluate the validity of the scales. First, every member of the panel of judges was asked to evaluate each individual interviewed as to how he judged the identification of the respondent with the Mexican-American population. These evaluations were carried out independent of the other members of the panel. Five choices were provided: (a) strongly identifies as Mexican-American; (b) seems to identify as Mexican-American; (c) undecided, i.e., I know this person but do not feel qualified to express an opinion; (d) does not seem to identify as Mexican-American; and (e) definitely does not identify as Mexican-American. An additional category, (f) I do not know this person, was also provided. Evaluations were scored on a 1 to 5

continuum with (a) as 1, (b) as 2, and so forth. Respondents known by at least three judges were assigned a mean score, that is, the scores assigned by the judges were totaled and a mean score derived for each respondent. Twenty-three respondents were known by at least three of the judges. Mean judges scores were then compared to the scores on the Identity scale and the Interaction scale. Observed correlation coefficients were .5575 and .7962 respectively, with $P<.0005$ (See Table 3). The second procedure was a comparison of the identity score and the interaction score for each of the thirty-two respondents in the total sample. The observed correlation coefficient was .5951, with $P<.0005$ (See Table 7).

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Scale reliability. The Kuder-Richardson formula was used to compute the coefficient of internal consistency for each scale (Summers, 1970:88-89). With data from the four communities combined the reliability coefficient of the Identity scale was .8500 and the coefficient of the Interaction scale was .8318. Separate reliability coefficients for each of the four communities are reported in Table 6. Product-moment correlations between items and the scale scores were also computed and are reported in Tables 4 and 5. With the data

[TABLES 4, 5, 6 ABOUT HERE]

from the four communities combined the point-biserial correlation of each of the items on both scales--with one exception--exceeded .264, the .0005 level of significance for an N of 151. The exception, Item 2 in the Interaction

scale, is concerned with activity in political organizations. Among the four communities, only five individuals indicated any activity in Mexican-American political organizations. Whereas this item was very close to the .05 level of significance, and deleting it from the scale had no significant effect on the reliability coefficient, it was retained for future analysis.

Correlation coefficients between scores on the Identity scale and scores on the Interaction scale for individuals in each community were also computed and are reported in Table 7. Separately, that is, by community, and with the total sample combined the correlation coefficients indicate a relationship significantly different from zero.

[TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE]

Homogeneity of variances. The variances of both scales were tested for homogeneity. It was assumed that if there were no significant difference between the variances that this would lend credence to the position that the samples drawn from the four populations were indeed random. In other words, though heterogenous variances between samples would not negate the randomness of the samples, homogeneity of variances would certainly lend support to this position. Furthermore, homogeneity of variances would strengthen the reliability of the scales. The Fmax test developed by Hartley to test for equality of variance was used to test the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the variances of the four samples (Meredith, 1967:208). Separate tests were conducted for each scale. In each case Lubbock had the maximum variance and McAllen the minimum variance. Computed F's of 1.404 (Identity scale) and 2.7472 (Interaction scale) with 37 d.f. did not support rejection

of the null hypothesis (See Table 8). Thus, it was concluded that there is no significant difference between the variances of the four samples thereby supporting the position that the samples are representative of the four populations.

[TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE]

Comparison of means. Although the expressed purpose of this paper is to present the two scales and the procedures involved in their development, it is of heuristic value to proffer data concerning the mean scores of the four samples. Analysis of variance revealed a significant difference between means on both scales: Identity scale, $P<.002$; Interaction scale, $P<.033$. Results of a paired comparison of means using the Scheffé method (Glass and Standley, 1970:388ff; Walker and Lev, 1969:304) are presented in Table 9. Mean scores of Austin and Lubbock both differ significantly from McAllen on the Identity scale, with Austin and Lubbock scores revealing stronger identification as Mexican-American. Waco, though not differing significantly from the other communities, was appreciably closer to McAllen than either Austin or Lubbock. Comparison of mean scores for each item in the scale revealed a similar pattern, with McAllen exhibiting the highest mean score--least identification--followed in decreasing order by Waco, Austin, and Lubbock.

Paired comparison of mean scores on the Interaction scale revealed Waco as the only community differing significantly from the other communities. Comparison of mean scores for each item in the scale again revealed a consistent pattern with McAllen, in this case, having the lowest mean score--greatest

interaction--followed in ascending order by Lubbock, Austin, and Waco.

[TABLE 9 ABOUT HERE]

Conclusion. As noted earlier, it is not intended that any conclusions concerning the Mexican-American population be drawn from the presentation of these scales. Rather, these scales are proffered as methodological instruments to be employed as dependent, or possibly independent, variables in future research and analysis of the Mexican-American population. The items included in these scales are certainly not exhaustive and it is reasonable to assume that additional items may be suggested in the course of future research. Furthermore, it should be noted that the samples used in the development of these scales present several limitations. The most obvious, of course, is the select socioeconomic status of the sample population. The reliability and validity of the scales for use with lower-class and working-class Mexican-Americans remains to be examined. Secondly, the communities from which the samples were drawn are rather homogenous in size. Also, comparison with Mexican-American populations in other geographic locales is needed. It is intended, then, that these scales provide a heuristic base for such analyses in the future.

TABLE 1

MEXICAN AMERICAN IDENTITY INDEX: SCALE ITEMS*

Item 1	Subject:	Attitudes toward teaching children to speak Spanish.
	Phrasing:	Have (did, will) you taught your children to speak Spanish? Yes__No__ Why/Why not?
	Scoring:	(1)Yes, positive statement; (2)Yes, neutral or no comment; (3)Neutral statement, or no response; (4)No, no comment, positive or neutral statement (including cannot speak); (5)No, negative statement
Item 2	Subject:	Attitudes toward visitation to Mexico.
	Phrasing:	Check the one response below which best describes your feelings about visitation to Mexico.
	Scoring:	Scored in reverse order. (1)I have no desire to visit Mexico; (2)I would like to visit Mexico, because it has some nice tourist attractions; (3)I would not mind visiting Mexico, but it really does not matter to me one way or the other; (4)I would like to visit Mexico because that is where my ancestors came from; (5)Every Mexican American should want to visit Mexico as the place of his heritage
Item 3	Subject:	Importance of children visiting Mexico.
	Phrasing:	How important do you feel that it is for your children to have the opportunity to visit in Mexico?
	Scoring:	(1)I feel that it is very important for my children to have the opportunity to visit in Mexico; (2)I feel that it is important, but not necessary that my children have the opportunity to visit in Mexico; (3)Undecided; (4)I do not feel that it is really very important that my children have the opportunity to visit in Mexico; (5)I definitely do not feel that it is at all important for my children to visit in Mexico
Item 4	Subject:	Attitude toward being referred to as "Chicano."
Item 5	Subject:	Attitude toward being referred to as "Mexicano."
	Phrasing:	Circle that response which best represents your reaction should someone refer to you by the following terms.
	Scoring:	(1)Definitely do not object to being referred to by this term; (2)Do not object to being referred to by this term; (3)Uncertain; (4)Object to being referred to by this term; (5)Definitely object to being referred to by this term

Table 1, continued

Item 6 Item 7 Item 8 Item 9	Subject:	Importance respondent attaches to his children being acquainted with the following: Item 6, Mexican history; Item 7, Mexican culture; Item 8, the history of the Mexican-American people; Item 9, the culture of the Mexican-American people.
	Phrasing:	Circle the number which best represents your attitudes about the following questions. How important do you feel that it is for your children to be acquainted with Mexican history? ...Mexican culture? ...the history of the Mexican-American people? ...the culture of the Mexican-American people?
	Scoring:	(1)Very important; (2)Important; (3)Uncertain, includes do not plan to have any children; (4)Not important; (5)Definitely not important
Item 10 Item 11 Item 12	Subject:	Attitudes toward the following Mexican-American organizations: Item 10, LULAC; Item 11, La Raza Unida; Item 12, G. I. Forum.
	Phrasing:	In your own words, briefly express your attitude toward each of the following organizations (if the respondent was not acquainted with an organization, this was to be noted in the space provided).
	Scoring:	(1)Positive statement concerning the organization; (3)Neutral or no commemt, not acquainted with; (5)Negative statement concerning the organization
Item 13 Item 14 Item 15	Subject:	Attitudes toward contributing to the following Mexican-American organizations: Item 13, LULAC; Item 14, La Raza Unida; Item 15, G. I. Forum.
	Phrasing:	Circle that response which best represents your probable response if you were asked to contribute to each of the following organizations.
	Scoring:	(1)Would definitely contribute something; (2)Would probably contribute something; (3)Uncertain; (4)Probably would not contribute something; (5)Definitely would not contribute something
Item 16	Subject:	Reference group with which the respondent identifies.
	Phrasing:	Which of the reference groups do you identify with most?
	Scoring:	(1)The Mexican-American population; (3)although not listed on the interview schedule, if the respondent stated both, or gave no response, a score of 3 was assigned; (5)The non-Spanish-surname population

*Numerals in parentheses indicate score assigned for the response which follows.

TABLE 2

MEXICAN-AMERICAN INTERACTION INDEX (BEHAVIOR): SCALE ITEMS*

Item 1	Subject:	Close friends of respondent.
	Phrasing:	List the specific occupation (not name) of two close friends. Are these individuals Spanish-surname, Anglo, other? (Identify other).
	Scoring:	(1)Both friends listed, Spanish-surname; (2)Only one friend listed, Spanish-surname; (3)One friend Spanish-surname, other Anglo or other; (4)Only one name listed, Anglo or other; (5)Both friends listed Anglo or other
Item 2	Subject:	Activity in Mexican-American political organizations.
	Phrasing:	Are you active in any political organization which is specifically Mexican-American (Chicano) oriented? (Yes or No). If so, would you mind listing their names?
	Scoring:	(1)Two or more listed; (2)One listed; (5)None listed
Item 3	Subject:	Current church membership and/or attendance.
	Phrasing:	A combination of several interview items: a. Do you currently hold membership in a church? If you do not hold membership, but do attend services, indicate with the word "attend;" b. If yes, which domination (church body)?; c. Concerning the church you now attend, is it (check one): 1. predominantly Anglo, 2. predominantly Mexican American (Spanish surname), 3. predominantly Negro, 4. about the same proportion of Anglos and Mexican Americans, 5. about the same proportion of Mexican Americans and Negroes, 6. about the same proportion of Anglos, Mexican Americans, and Negroes.
	Scoring:	(1)Catholic, and 2, 4, 5, or 6 above; (2)Non-Catholic, and 2, 4, 5, or 6 above; (3)Does not attend church; (4)Catholic, and 1 or 3 above; (5)Non-Catholic, and 1 or 3 above
Item 4	Subject:	Church attendance and attendance at Spanish services.
	Phrasing:	Combination of church attended (see above) and answer to the following statement: Do you ever attend religious services conducted in Spanish? Yes__ No__
	Scoring:	(1)Attends Catholic church, Spanish services; (2)Attends non-Catholic church, Spanish services; (3)Does not attend church; (4)Attends Catholic church, no Spanish services; (5)Attends non-Catholic church, no Spanish services

Table 2, continued

Item 5	Subject:	Organizational membership.
	Phrasing:	List under each of the categories below organizations to which you now belong. (Categories listed: a. social, b. fraternal, c. political, d. business and professional, e. other.) Note any organizations which are specifically Mexican-American. (Followed by two additional questions related to ethnic make-up of each organization and the extent to which the respondent is active in the organization.)
	Scoring:	(1)More than one Mexican-American organization listed; (2)One Mexican-American organization listed; (3)No organizations listed; (4)One non-Mexican-American organization listed, no Mexican-American organizations listed; (5)More than one non-Mexican-American organization listed, no Mexican-American organizations listed
Item 6	Subject:	Use of Spanish when visiting with friends.
Item 7	Subject:	Use of Spanish at social gatherings.
Item 8	Subject:	Use of Spanish in public.
	Phrasing:	Indicate the degree to which you use Spanish in each of the situations listed below by placing the corresponding number from the choices provided. (Choices listed: always, most of the time, occasionally, seldom, never.) Situations listed: when visiting with friends, at social gatherings, in public.
	Scoring:	(1)Always and most of the time; (2)Occasionally; (3)Neutral or no response; (4)Seldom; (5)Never
Item 9	Subject:	Spanish language literature.
	Phrasing:	Combination of several interview schedule items. 1. Do you subscribe to, or purchase, any Spanish-language literature? Yes__No__ 2. Do you ever read any Spanish-language literature? Yes__No__ 3. If answer is yes, place a check by those items read (followed by: newspapers, professional and/or business, literary, political, news magazines, other). 4. If no, why do you not read any Spanish-language literature?
	Scoring:	(1)Subscribe to and read; (2)Do not subscribe to, but read; (3)No response; (4)Do not subscribe to, do not read, neutral comment or cannot read; (5)Do not subscribe to, do not read, negative comment
Item 10	Subject:	Books in the home related to specific subjects.
	Phrasing:	Do you have any books in your home specifically concerning the following subjects? (Note: these may be written in either Spanish or English). a. Mexican culture, history, etc. b. Mexican-American culture, history, etc. c. Spanish culture, history, etc. (Yes__No__ preceeding each category).
	Scoring:	(1)Yes to all three items; (2)Yes to two items; (3)Yes to a or b only; (4)Yes to c only; (5)No to all three items

Table 2, continued

Item 11 Subject: Spanish-language radio broadcasts.
Item 12 Phrasing: (Separate questions) Do you ever listen to Spanish-language radio broadcasts originating in the United States? ...originating in Mexico? Yes__ No__ If yes, how often do you listen to these programs? Choices listed: a. several times a week, b. at least once a week, c. at least once a month, d. less than once a month. If no, why not?
Scoring: (1)Yes, a or b; (2)Yes, c or d; (3)No response or cannot receive; (4)No, neutral response or cannot understand; (5)No, negative response

Item 13 Subject: Visitation patterns.
Item 14 Phrasing: We are interested in finding out who visits in your
Item 15 home, and how often. Also, we would like to know in whose home(s) you visit and how often. Please check the category which best describes the visitation patterns listed below. Item 13, about how often do you entertain (visit with) the following people in your home? Mexican-Americans (Spanish surname). (Note: several other categories followed including Anglos, your employer, employees, fellow employees, and your neighbors.) Item 14, about how often do you visit in the homes of the following: Mexican-Americans (Spanish surname). (Note: same categories as listed under Item 13 followed.) Item 15, About how often do you visit in the home(s) of Mexican Americans (Spanish surnamed) who reside in predominantly Mexican-American neighborhoods?
Scoring: (1)Very often (at least once a month); (2)Often (several times a year); (3)Seldom (once or twice a year); (4)Hardly ever (less than once a year); (5)Never

Item 16 Subject: Entertainment: Mexican-American functions.
Phrasing: Do you ever attend any functions which are specifically Mexican-American? Yes__No__ If you answered yes, list those specific Mexican-American functions which you do attend (followed by question concerning frequency of attendance). If no, indicate why not in the space below....
Scoring: (1)Three or more listed; (2)Two listed; (3)One listed; (4)No, neutral or no comment; (5)No, negative comment.

Item 17 Subject: Use of Mexican-American owned businesses.
Phrasing: Indicate that one choice which best describes your position about Mexican-American owned business establishments (for example: clothing stores, gas stations, etc.).

Table 2, continued

Scoring: (1)Always make a point of patronizing Mexican-American business establishments when available; (2)Generally, if I have a choice, I will patronize Mexican-American owned business establishments; (3)Does not really matter to me whether the business establishment is owned by Mexican-Americans or Anglos; (4)Generally do not patronize Mexican-American owned business establishments; (5)Never

Item 18 Subject: Knowledge of, and use of, godparents.
Phrasing: Combination of several interview schedule items.
1. Are you acquainted with compadrazgo? Yes__No__
2. If you now have children (or plan to have children) do they (will they) have godparents? Yes__No__ Uncertain__Not applicable__ 3. If yes, do you consider (will consider) their godparents compadres? Yes__No__Uncertain__Not applicable
Scoring: (1)Children do (will) have godparents, considered compadres; (2)Children do (will) have godparents, not considered compadres; (3)Neutral, uncertain, no response; (4)Blank; (5)Children do not (will not) have godparents

Item 19 Subject: Marital status, that is, ethnicity of wife.
Phrasing: Note: this data was completed by the interviewer. Is the respondent married? If yes, is his wife: Mexican-American, Anglo, Negro, Other.
Scoring: (1)Wife Mexican-American; (3)Not married, or data not available; (5)Wife Anglo, Negro, or other.

---

*Numerals in parentheses indicate score assigned for the response which follows.

TABLE 3

CORRELATION OF SCALE SCORES
AND JUDGES' SCORES: WACO

	Identity Scale	Interaction Scale	Judges' Scores
Identity Scale	1.0000		
Interaction Scale	.6379	1.0000	
Judges' Scores	.5575	.7962	1.0000
N=23	P<.0005		

TABLE 4

MEXICAN-AMERICAN IDENTITY SCALE: ITEM ANALYSIS*

Item Number	Waco N=32	Austin N=51	McAllen N=41	Lubbock N=27	Four Communities Combined N=151
1	.193	.574	.019	.309	.306
2	.677	.390	.456	.258	.502
3	.438	.719	.674	.448	.564
4	.518	.455	.533	.455	.528
5	.368	.459	.306	.391	.428
6	.833	.755	.748	.716	.752
7	.721	.685	.676	.590	.683
8	.822	.772	.865	.814	.808
9	.762	.779	.821	.758	.779
10	.510	.421	.569	.691	.524
11	.373	.476	.285	.463	.440
12	.465	.465	.431	.698	.530
13	.562	.580	.679	.816	.648
14	.579	.679	.347	.725	.625
15	.568	.606	.548	.842	.637
16	.495	.457	.293	.517	.394

*Product-moment correlations between items and the scale score.

TABLE 5

MEXICAN-AMERICAN INTERACTION SCALE
(BEHAVIOR): ITEM ANALYSIS*

Item Number	Waco N=32	Austin N=51	McAllen N=41	Lubbock N=27	Four Communities Combined N=151
1	.727	.408	.524	.581	.571
2	.233	.081	.000	.197	.100
3	.731	.431	.385	.683	.556
4	.804	.566	.470	.738	.624
5	.524	.638	.101	.652	.459
6	.121	.642	.583	.854	.594
7	.431	.602	.633	.791	.639
8	.214	.613	.419	.627	.535
9	.516	.480	.319	.636	.479
10	.298	.413	.362	.580	.409
11	.582	.540	.686	.737	.546
12	.450	.642	.588	.562	.575
13	.351	.583	.393	.782	.562
14	.543	.577	.332	.534	.507
15	.396	.606	.502	.540	.534
16	.643	.606	.588	.540	.544
17	.346	.492	.058	.555	.383
18	.480	.412	.205	.170	.349
19	.394	.276	.408	.595	.395

*Product-moment correlations between items and the scale score.

TABLE 6

MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND COEFFICIENT OF INTERNAL CONSISTENCY FOR TOTAL SCALE SCORES

Scale	Waco N=32	Austin N=51	McAllen N=41	Lubbock N=27	Four Communities Combined N=151
Identity					
Mean	41.9375	37.6274	44.5610	35.3704	40.0199
Standard Deviation	11.5338	10.7759	10.3394	12.2542	11.5323
Alpha*	.8361	.8478	.8239	.8641	.8500
Interaction					
Mean	52.5313	49.2745	44.7561	46.1481	48.1788
Standard Deviation	11.7116	11.8425	9.2650	15.3565	12.1349
Alpha*	.7969	.8407	.7417	.8982	.8318

*Alpha coefficient of internal consistency indicates scale reliability computed by using the Kuder-Richardson formula.

TABLE 7

CORRELATION BETWEEN SCORES ON IDENTITY SCALE AND INTERACTION SCALE*

Waco N=32	Austin N=51	McAllen N=41	Lubbock N=27	Four Communities Combined N=151
.5951	.6758	.2758	.4839	.4754
P<.0005	P<.0005	P<.05	P<.005	P<.0005

*Correlation between each individual's total score on the identity scale and his total score on the interaction scale.

TABLE 8

TEST FOR HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCE*

Scale	Standard Deviation	Fmax/min	F	k	d.f.	P
Identity	12.2542/10.3394	150.16/106.93	1.404	4	37	>.10**
Interaction	15.3565/9.2650	235.82/85.84	2.7472	4	37	>.05**

*Hartley's Fmax test. Standard deviations for Lubbock (maximum) and McAllen (minimum).

**Failed to reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the variances of the four samples.

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF MEANS USING THE SCHEFFE' METHOD

Communities	Means	Difference Between Means	F d.f.=3,147	P<
Identity Scale*				
Waco/Austin	41.937/37.627	4.310	.988	.5986
Waco/McAllen	41.937/44.561	-2.623	.335	.8028
Waco/Lubbock	41.937/35.370	6.567	1.709	.1663
Austin/McAllen	37.627/44.561	-6.934	2.956	.0337
Austin/Lubbock	37.627/35.370	2.257	.243	.8667
McAllen/Lubbock	44.561/35.370	9.191	3.720	.0129
Interaction Scale*				
Waco/Austin	52.531/49.274	3.257	.491	.6936
Waco/McAllen	52.531/44.756	7.775	2.556	.0564
Waco/Lubbock	52.531/46.148	6.383	1.404	.2429
Austin/McAllen	49.274/44/756	4.518	1.092	.3550
Austin/Lubbock	49.274/46.148	3.126	.406	.7526
McAllen/Lubbock	44.756/46.148	-1.392	.074	.9729

*Analysis of variance with four communities combined: Identity Scale, F=4.975, d.f.=3,147, P<.002; Interaction Scale, F=2.964, d.f.=3,147, P<.033.

REFERENCES

1971 Austin City Directory. Dallas: Hudspeth Directory Company, Publishers.

Duncan, Otis Dudley

1961 "A Socioeconomic Index for All Occupations," in Albert J. Reiss, Jr. (ed.), Occupations and Social Status. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Glass, Gene V. and Julian C. Stanley

1970 Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Gordon, M. M.

1958 Social Class in American Sociology. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press.

Hall, John and D. G. Jones

1950 "Social Grading of Occupations." British Journal of Sociology 1 (March):31-40.

Huntsberger, David V.

1967 Elements of Statistical Inference. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

1971 Lubbock City Directory. Dallas: Hudspeth Directory Company, Publishers.

1972 McAllen City Directory. Loveland, Colorado: Johnson Publishing Company.

Meredith, William M.

1967 Basic Mathematical and Statistical Tables for Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Nam, Charles B.

1963 Methodology and Sources of Socioeconomic Status. Washington: U. S. Bureau of Census, Working Paper No. 15.

Reiss, Albert J., Jr.
1961 Occupations and Social Status. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Smith, Mapheus
1943 "An Empirical Scale of Prestige Status of Occupations." American Sociological Review 8 (April): 185-192

Summers, Gene F. (ed.)
1970 Attitude Measurement. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Teske, Raymond, Jr. and Bardin H. Nelson
1973 "Middle-Class Mexican-American Population of Waco." Texas Journal of Science 25 (June): in press.

1970 Waco City Directory. Dallas: Hudspeth Directory Company, Publishers.

Walker, Helen M. and Joseph Lev
1969 Elementary Statistical Methods. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, Inc.